

Comment Number	Did Response Address Comment?	Confirmed Change in Surface Water and Sediment Trap FSP?
Primary Comments		
1	Yes	Pending review
2	Yes, pending review of the forthcoming task hazard analysis that will be added to the project HASP.	Pending review
3	Yes, assuming the proposed revisions to the FSP are adequate. The response states "the FSP will be revised to explain how the study design provides for capturing SMB movement at these two spatial scales."	Pending review
4	The response partially contradicts EPA comment #7 with respect not collecting fish during spawning. The response states: "By focusing on the central part of the Site and collecting fish when they are spawning, the potential for a tagged fish to exit the study area is minimized as it would require the tagged fish to travel 3 miles upstream or downstream to exit the study area."	Pending review
5	Yes	Pending review
6	Yes	Pending review
7	The response contradicts the comment. The response states: "According to discussions with experts including the Oregon Bass and Panfish Club and AECOM fishery biologists, the month of May is an ideal time to locate and capture SMB in the LWR. The SMB are expected to be in pre-spawn, spawn, and post-spawn phases of the annual cycle in early May when the fish collection and tagging is scheduled to take place. Locating and capturing SMB via hook-and-line is more efficient during these phases as fish are typically in shallow, predictable locations. They tend to remain near their nest sites and are not expected to move large distances or exit the study area at this time of year. We maintain that early May is ideal for tagging SMB and initiating the study." This approach samples the exception (spawning area) rather than the rule (core residency area). These fish should be caught in their "home pool" post-spawning and their movement from there assessed. Sampling pre- or during-spawn fish weakens the study design.	Pending review
8	The response contradicts the comment. The response states: "We do not agree with EPA's request. There are currently multiple experts already engaged and committed to the study." The response goes on to specify the experts involved and their expertise. Note: this response was intended to be moved to the "To Be Considered" Comments; however, the edited version of the comments was not sent to AECOM.	Pending review
9	Yes	Pending review
10	Yes	Pending review
11	Yes	Pending review
12	Yes	Pending review
13	Yes, pending review of the forthcoming SOPs.	Pending review
14	Yes	Pending review
To be Considered Comments		
1	Yes	Pending review
2	Yes	Pending review
3	Yes, pending review of the forthcoming equipment list.	Pending review
4	Yes	Pending review
Matters of Style Comments		
1	Yes	Pending review
2	Yes	Pending review
3	Yes	Pending review
	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	
	Indicates a Conditional Approval need and callout for extra attention to the RLSO in the FSP and/or QAPP	
	Not responsive and needs correction	